

Serial No. **10/801,565**

Docket No. **IK-0084**

Reply to Office Action dated May 16, 2006

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached drawing includes changes to Fig. 1. This sheet, which includes Fig. 1, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 1. In Fig. 1, the label "PRIOR ART" has been added. No new matter is added.

Attachments: Replacement Sheet (1)
Annotated Sheet (1)

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the Abstract, drawings, specification, and claims 1, 4, 5, and 9 are amended, and claims 10 and 11 are added. Support for the claims can be found throughout the specification, including the original claims, and the drawings. Withdrawal of the rejections in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action objected to Fig. 1, indicating that it should include the legend "Prior Art." Claim 1 has been amended to include the legend "Prior Art." Accordingly, the objection should be withdrawn.

The Office Action objected to the drawings under 37 CFR §1.83(a), alleging that "[t]he drawings fail to clearly illustrate the structure of the tilting latch; how its lower end is hingedly assembled with the support frame; and how the latch jaw engages with the stopper pin; as mentioned in claims 4 and 7." It is assumed that the Examiner intended to address claims 4 and 9. Claims 4 and 9 have been amended to improve their clarity. Further, their features are clearly shown in at least Figures 3 and 4. Accordingly, the objection should be withdrawn.

The Office Action objected to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 CFR §1.84(a)(5) because they include the following reference characters not mentioned in the description: "A" in Figure 3 and "104b" shown in Figure 4. The rejection is respectfully traversed. "A" shown in Figure 3 is disclosed at page 16, line 20. "104b" shown in Figure 4

is disclosed at page 12, line 8 of the specification. Accordingly, the objection should be withdrawn.

The Office Action objected to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 CFR §1.83(p)(5) because the specification allegedly does not include the following reference signs mentioned in this description: "104bk" on page 13, line 24: and "104" on page 13, line 25. However, the specification has been amended to delete the reference to "104bk" and correct this typographical error. "104" is show in Figure 3. Accordingly, the objection should be withdrawn.

The Office Action objected to Figure 4 because it fails to include section lines. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As set forth on page 7 of the specification "Figure 4 is a top plan view of several elements, including cover brackets, of a drawer type door opening/closing structure according to a preferred embodiment of the present invention." One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that Figure 4 shows a top view of the freezer compartment door in a closed position, support frame 104, 104', cover bracket 109, 109'. Accordingly, the objection should be withdrawn.

The Office Action objected to claim 1 because of an informality. This objection has been made moot by the amendments discussed above. Accordingly, the objection should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner's comments have been addressed in amending independent claims 1 and 5. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-2 and 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 2,116,370 to Watkins. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1 and 5 have been amended to recite a drawer type door opening/closing structure for a refrigerator comprising, *inter alia*, "at least one support frame hingedly connected to a rear surface of the door thereby creating a hinge connection to allow the door to pivot about the lower end of the door and allow a storage box for storing an object to be seated behind the door," and "at least one cover bracket protruding backward from the rear surface of the door and configured to cover a gap between the support frame and the rear surface of the door and the hinge connection." Watkins does not disclose or suggest such features, or the claimed combination of independent claims 1 and 5.

That is, it is noted that Watkins discloses a file cabinet, not a drawer type door opening/closing structure for a refrigerator. Further, element 23 asserted by the Examiner as corresponding to the claimed at least one cover bracket does not cover the hinge connection

Reply to Office Action dated May 16, 2006

between side wall 7 asserted by the Examiner as corresponding to the at least one support frame and the rear surface of the door 17.

Accordingly, the rejection of independent claims 1 and 5 over Watkins should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 2 and 6-7 are allowable over Watkins at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claims 1 and 5, from which they respectively depend, as well as for their added features.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-2 and 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 2,711,944 to Meek in view of Watkins. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner asserted that Meek teaches all of the claimed features except for "a door being capable of being pivoted about a lower end of said door; at least one support frame hingedly connected to a rear surface of the door to allow the door to pivot about the lower end of said door; or at least one cover bracket protruding backward from the rear surface of the door to cover a gap between the support frame and the rear surface of the door, wherein said cover bracket is located outside of the support frame when the door stands upright." The Examiner then asserted that Watkins discloses such features and concludes that "[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to replace the door in the structure of Meek with the pivoting door taught by Watkins in order to allow objects to be more easily positioned within, and removed from the refrigerator, thereby providing the structure substantially as claimed.

Reply to Office Action dated May 16, 2006

As set forth above, element 23 asserted by the Examiner as corresponding to the claimed at least one cover bracket does not cover the hinge connection between side wall 7 asserted by the Examiner as corresponding to the at least one support frame and the rear surface of the door 17. Thus, Meek and Watkins, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the claimed features of independent claims 1 and 5.

Accordingly, the rejection of independent claims 1 and 5 over Meek and Watkins should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 2 and 6-7 are allowable over Meek and Watkins at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claims 1 and 5, from which they respectively depend, as well as for their added features.

The Office Action rejected claims 3 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Meek in view of Watkins and U.S. Patent No. 5,487,239 to Jenkins. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dependent claims 3 and 8 are allowable over Meek and Watkins at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claims 1 and 5, from which they respectively depend, as well as for their added features. Jenkins fails to overcome the deficiency of Meek and Watkins, as it is merely cited for allegedly disclosing a door basket. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 4 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Meek in view of Watkins and U.S. Patent No. 2,775,501 to Kylo. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dependent claims 4 and 9 are allowable over Meek and Watkins at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claims 1 and 5, from which they

Serial No. **10/801,565**

Docket No. **IK-0084**

Reply to Office Action dated May 16, 2006

respectively depend, as well as for their added features. Kylo fails to overcome the deficiency of Meek and Watkins, as it is merely cited for allegedly disclosing a tilting latch. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP


Carol L. Druzbeck
Registration No. 40,287

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK:CLD/knh/kah

Date: August 16, 2006

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610

\\Fk4\Documents\2047\2047-083\95401.doc



ANNOTATED SHEET

FIG. 1

PRIOR ART

